Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 128

VERNON KIMBROUGH, PETITIONER

vs.

UNITED STATES

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

INDEX

	Original	Print
Record from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky		
Relevant docket entries	1	1
Indictment	2	2
Judgment and commitment	5	5
Motion to vacate sentence	6	7
Order re filing briefs	8	8
Memorandum in support of motion to vacate sentence	9	9
Memorandum opposing motion to vacate sentence	10	10
Order denying motion to vacate sentence	13	13
Affidavit and motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis	14	14
Order granting leave to proceed in forma pauperis	16	15
Notice of appeal	17	16
Proceedings in the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit	18	17
Judgment	18	17
Order granting leave to proceed in forma pauperis and petition for certiorari	19	18

[fol. 1]

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

RELEVANT DOCKET ENTRIES

ITEM	PLEADING	DATE FILED
1	Indictment	4-28-41
2	Judgment and Commitment	4-28-41
3	Motion to Vacate Sentence	4-9-59
4	Order Placing Counsel on Time for Filing Briefs	4-13-59
5	Memorandum of Defendant	4-28-59
6	Memorandum of U. S. Opposing Motion to Vacate	5-4-59
7	Order Denying Motion to Vacate	6-2-59
8	Affidavit and Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis	6-16-59
9	Order Permitting Defendant to File Notice of Appeal in Forma Pauperis	6-16-59
10	Notice of Appeals	7-13-59
11	Designation of Record on Appeal	7-13-59

• • • •

[fol. 2] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

April Term, 1941,
At Richmond

INDICTMENT—Filed April 28, 1941

The Grand Jurors of the United States of America, duly impaneled, sworn, and charged to inquire within and for the Eastern District of Kentucky, upon their oaths do find and present;—

That, heretofore, to-wit, on and about the 19th day of January, 1941, and between said date and the 13th day of February, 1941, before the finding of this indictment in said Eastern District of Kentucky, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, Edwin Wade Sharpe, William Edward Sanders and Vernon Kimbrough, hereinafter called defendants, did unlawfully and feloniously conspire to commit offenses against the United States, that is, to transport and cause to be transported in interstate commerce from Florida, Georgia, and other foreign States, to the State of Kentucky, motor vehicles which had theretofore been stolen, knowing the same to have been so stolen, and to receive, conceal and store said motor vehicles so stolen and so transported, which were moving as, were a part of and did constitute interstate commerce, knowing the same to have been so stolen;

And that while said conspiracy existed and to effect the object thereof, said defendants committed the following overt acts, to-wit:

That, on or about the 12th day of February, 1941, they, the said defendants unlawfully and feloniously transported in interstate commerce from Atlanta, in the State of Georgia, to Owen County, near Frankfort, Kentucky, in the Eastern District of Kentucky, one 1941 grey Super DeLuxe Ford two-door sedan automobile, Motor No. 18-5929623, which the said defendants had theretofore stolen or caused to be stolen from the Roundtree Motor Company, A. Jack Roundtree, owner, Lake City, Florida, they, the said defendants then and there well knowing that said motor vehicle had been so stolen.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

[fol. 3] That on or about the 19th day of January, 1941, and between said date and the 13th day of February, 1941, they, the said defendants unlawfully and feloniously did receive, conceal and store the aforesaid automobile, while the same was moving as, was a part of and did constitute interstate commerce, from Lake City, in the State of Florida, to Owen County, in the State of Kentucky, they then and there well knowing that same had been stolen from the Roundtree Motor Company, A. Jack Roundtree, owner, Lake City, Florida, and transported in interstate commerce to Owen County, in the State of Kentucky, as aforesaid.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

SECOND COUNT

And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further find and present;—

That, heretofore, to-wit, on and about the 12th day of February, 1941, before the finding of this indictment in said Eastern District of Kentucky, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, they, the said Edwin Wade Sharpe, William Edward Sanders and Vernon Kimbrough, did unlawfully and feloniously transport and cause to be transported in interstate commerce, from Atlanta, in the State of Georgia, to Owen County, Kentucky, in the Eastern District of Kentucky, near Frankfort, Kentucky, one 1941 Super DeLuxe Ford two-door sedan automobile, Motor No. 18-5929623, which had been theretofore stolen from the Roundtree Motor Company, A. Jack Roundtree, owner, Lake City, Florida, they, the said defendants, and each of them, then and there well knowing that said automobile had been stolen as aforesaid.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

THIRD COUNT

And the Grand Jurors aforesaid, upon their oaths aforesaid, do further find and present;—

[fol. 4] That, heretofore, to-wit, on and about the 19th day of January, 1941, and between said date and the 13th day of February, 1941, before the finding of this indictment in said Eastern District of Kentucky, and within the jurisdiction of this Court, they, the said Edwin Wade Sharpe, William Edward Sanders and Vernon Kimbrough, did unlawfully and feloniously receive, conceal, and store one 1941 grey Super DeLuxe Ford two-door automobile, Motor No. 18-5929623, which had theretofore been stolen from the Roundtree Motor Company, A. Jack Roundtree, owner, at Lake City, Florida, on January 19, 1941, was then and there moving as, was a part of, and constituted interstate commerce, from Lake City, in the State of Florida, to Owen County, near Frankfort, Kentucky, in the Eastern District of Kentucky, they and each of them then and there well knowing that said automobile had been so stolen.

Contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided, and against the peace and dignity of the United States of America.

/s/ John T. Metcalf
United States Attorney

18-88;
18-408.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

[fol. 5] (File Endorsement Omitted)

DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
Eastern District, Kentucky-Richmond Division

No. 4768 Criminal [1] indictment in three counts for violation of U. S. C., Title 18, Secs. 88 and 408

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

VERNON KIMBROUGH

JUDGMENT AND COMMITMENT—April 28, 1941

On this 28th day of April, 1941, came the United States Attorney, and the defendant Vernon Kimbrough appearing in proper person, and by counsel, James E. Keyser, a regular practicing attorney of this [2] Court and,

The defendant having been convicted on [3] his plea of guilty of the offense charged in the [1] indictment in the above-entitled cause, to wit [4] unlawfully conspiring to transport and conceal automobiles in interstate commerce, and transporting and concealing same and the defendant having been now asked whether he has anything to say why judgment should not be pronounced against him, and no sufficient cause to the contrary being shown or appearing to the Court, IT IS BY THE COURT

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the defendant, having been found guilty of said offenses, is hereby committed to the custody of the Attorney General for imprisonment in an institution of the penitentiary or reformatory type to be designated by the Attorney General or his authorized representative for the period of [6]

Count No. 1 Two (2) Years
Count No. 2 Five (5) Years
Count No. 3 Five (5) Years

said sentences to be served consecutively, the sentence on the first count to be served first and that said defendant be imprisoned until said defendant is otherwise discharged as provided by law.[7]

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk deliver a certified copy of this judgment and commitment to the United [8] States Marshal or other qualified officer and that the same shall serve as the commitment herein.[9]

(Signed) H. Church Ford
H. CHURCH FORD
United States District Judge

A True Copy. Certified this 28th day of April, A. D. 1941

(Signed) (By)

A. B. Rouse, Clerk Deputy Clerk

---

[1] Indictment or information. [2] Insert (*a*) "by counsel" or (*b*) "having been advised of his constitutional right to counsel and having been asked whether he desired counsel assigned by the Court, replied that he did not," whichever is applicable. [3] Insert the words "his plea of guilty," "plea of nolo contendere," or "verdict of guilty," as the case may be. [4] Name specific offense or offenses and specify counts upon which convicted. [5] Insert type of institution such as "jail," "training school," "reformatory," "penitentiary," or "special." If prisoner's circumstances require special type institution, Marshal should subject facts and recommendations of Court to Attorney General where regulations do not apply. [6] Insert sentence and any provision the payment of fine and state whether sentences are to run concurrently or consecutively and, if consecutively, when such term is to begin; that is, with reference to termination of preceding term, or with respect to any other outstanding or unserved sentence. [7] Strike out if Court did not so order. [8] Indicate any order with respect to suspension and probation. [9] Certified copy to accompany defendant to institution.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

[fol. 6] (File Endorsement Omitted)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

Case No. 4768
(Title 18, Section 2255, U.S.C.)

VERNON P. KIMBROUGH, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, RESPONDENT

MOTION TO VACATE SENTENCE—Filed April 9, 1959

Comes now Vernon P. Kimbrough, and respectfully moves this Court to vacate the sentence of five (5) years imposed on April 28, 1941 on Count III of the above-entitled case charging violation of 18 USCA, Section 408* (receiving and concealing a stolen motor vehicle constituting interstate commerce).

This motion is grounded on the allegations that the conviction was obtained in violation of laws and constitution of the United States, and, more specifically, that:

1. The offense of receiving and concealing merged into the consumated offense of transportation of the same motor vehicle as charged in Count II of the indictment.
2. Congress did not intend in enacting Section 408 that the transporter be also punished for receiving and concealing the same stolen motor vehicle.
3. Conviction and sentence for transporting in interstate commerce a stolen motor vehicle is a bar to punishment of the same person for receiving and concealing the same motor vehicle.

* Now section 2313 of Title 18, U.S.C.A.

[fol. 7] 4. Count III of the instant indictment does not charge an offense cognizable under the United States Penal Code.

The petitioner should have had a final release from the sentence imposed under Case. No. 4768 on or about October 1, 1952 and therefore is eligible for release forthwith.

/s/ Vernon P. Kimbrough
VERNON P. KIMBROUGH, Petitioner
P.M.B. No. 1273,
United States Penitentiary
Alcatraz Island, California

[fol. 8] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
RICHMOND

(Title Omitted)

ORDER RE FILING BRIEFS—April 13, 1959

The defendant having filed herein on April 9, 1959 his Motion to Vacate Sentence it is ORDERED that within twenty days from this date the defendant file and serve Memorandum in support of his Motion and within twenty days thereafter the plaintiff serve and file Brief in opposition, and pursuant to Rule 78 the submission and determination of the Motion shall be upon such Briefs without oral argument unless otherwise ordered by the Court.

H. CHURCH FORD
Judge

April 13, 1959

• • • •

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

[fol. 9] (File Endorsement Omitted)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
RICHMOND

(Title Omitted)

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO VACATE SENTENCE—Filed April 26, 1959

The petitioner has now filed in this Court an action entitled "Motion to Vacate Sentence". This memorandum is made in support thereof.

In his original pleading, the petitioner urges that the sentence of five (5) years imposed on Count III be vacated on the ground that the acts charged in Count III merged into the acts charged in Count II and upon which an additional sentence of five (5) years was imposed.

The petitioner contends that the "same transaction" test should be applied to the instant case. Bell v. United States, 349 U.S. 81; United States v. Universal C.I.T. Credit Corporation, 344 U.S. 218; Prince v. United States, 352 U.S. 322; Heflin v. United States, 79 S. Ct. 451.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that for the reasons aforesaid the motion should be sustained.

/s/ Vernon P. Kimbrough
VERNON P. KIMBROUGH
Petitioner
Box 1273
United States Penitentiary
Alcatraz, California

Dated: April 23, 1959
cc: U. S. Attorney

[fol. 10] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
AT RICHMOND

(Title Omitted)

MEMORANDUM OPPOSING MOTION TO VACATE SENTENCE—
Filed April 28, 1959

The defendant, in 1941, pleaded guilty to three counts of an indictment which charged, in effect, as follows:

(1) That defendant did conspire to commit a crime against the United States, to wit: to transport a motor vehicle in interstate commerce knowing same to have been stolen (2) Defendant moved in interstate commerce a motor vehicle knowing same to have been stolen and (3) receiving and concealing a motor vehicle knowing same to have been stolen. All three counts dealt with the same motor vehicle. The defendant was sentenced to 2, 5 and 5 years respectively on the counts, the sentences to run consecutively. Defendant now moves the Court to vacate sentence on Count 3 and alleges as grounds that the offense of receiving and concealing merged into the offense of transportation of same motor vehicle; Congress did not intend in enacting Section 408 (Now Title 18, Section 2313, USCA) that the transporter be also punished for receiving and concealing the same motor vehicle; sentence for transporting in interstate commerce is a bar to punishment of same person for receiving and concealing the same motor vehicle and that Count III does not charge an offense cognizable under the United States Penal Code.

[fol. 11] ARGUMENT

The defendant's contention and motion seems to be based solely on the "same transaction" test and he cites as authorities *Bell* v. *United States*, 349 US 81; *U. S.* v. *Universal C.I.T. Corp.*, 344 U.S. 218; *Prince* v. *U. S.* 352 U.S. 322; and *Heflin* v. *U. S.*, 79 S. Ct. 451. All the cases relied upon by the defendant state in effect that "double

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

punishment" is administered when one is convicted under 2 or more counts involving the "same transaction," such as "entering or attempting to enter any bank with intent to commit in such bank—any felony or larceny and robbery of the same bank. Clearly, the entering of a bank with intent to commit in such bank any felony and bank robbery are parts of only one transaction or the "same transaction" and one should not be punished except for the one transaction. However, the cases cited by the defendant do not have any bearing on the case at bar since the three counts contained in the indictment against the defendant are all separate and distinct offenses and arise not out of the "same transaction," but three separate transactions (See *Record* v. *Hudspeth,* 126 F.2d 215, 216).

The plea, autrefois acquit, to be availed of, must demonstrate that the offenses referred to are precisely the same in law and in fact, or, as said by Mr. Justice Harlan in *Burton* v. *United States,* 202 U.S. 344, in adopting the language of C. J. Shaw: "The plea will be vicious if the offenses charged in the two indictments be perfectly distinct in point of law, however nearly they may be connected in fact." Although there are not two indictments in the case at bar, the defendant complains that receiving and concealing is a part of the transporting. There is no merit in that argument since there are no common law crimes cognizable in the Federal Courts and the receiving and concealing section referred to is purely a creature of statute. It is not a combination of offenses, but is a distinct and separate offense in law.

[fol. 12] The test that should be used in deciding the question presented is, "whether acquittal or conviction on a similar count or charge bars conviction on another charge where the same evidence would be required to establish the commission of both crimes." (37 F.2d 846; 143 F.2d 544 and 149 F.2d 481). The evidence necessary to prove transporting is not sufficient to prove receiving and concealing.

The question at bar is not new to this Court. In *U. S.* v. *Runion,* 47 F. Supp. 594, *U. S.* v. *Dye,* 61 F. Supp. 457, and in *U. S.* v. *Spradley,* 65 F. Supp. 136, affirmed 162

F. 2d 203, the Court was faced with the same question and those cases firmly established the rule of law that double punishment is not imposed by sentencing a defendant on counts of transporting and receiving and concealing, even though the sentences on both are to run consecutively.

Conclusion

There are two separate and distinct offenses stated in the statute: First, the offense of transporting in interstate commerce a motor vehicle knowing the same to have been stolen, and second, receiving, concealing, storing, bartering, selling or disposing of a motor vehicle moving in interstate commerce knowing the same to have been stolen. Since there are two separate offenses and because the same evidence would not sustain the punishment under both counts, the "same transaction" test is not applicable. The motion to vacate sentence under Count 3 should be overruled.

Henry J. Cook
United States Attorney

By:
R. Caywood Metcalf
Assistant U. S. Attorney

This is to certify that service of the within brief was had this 4 day of May, 1959, by mailing a true copy to Vernon P. Kimbrough, Box 1273, U. S. Penitentiary, Alcatraz, California.

R. Caywood Metcalf
Assistant U. S. Attorney

POOR COPY

[fol. 13] (File Endorsement Omitted)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

(Title Omitted)

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO VACATE SENTENCE—
June 2, 1959

This cause coming on to be heard upon the Defendant's Motion to Vacate the Sentence imposed on Count Three of the indictment and the Court having considered the briefs filed on behalf of the respective parties and being advised, it is ORDERED and ADJUDGED that the motion to vacate the sentence imposed under Count Three of the above entitled case should be and is denied.

/s/ H. Church Ford
H. CHURCH FORD, Judge

June 2, 1959

• • • •

[fol. 14] (File Endorsement Omitted)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

(Title Omitted)

AFFIDAVIT AND MOTION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA PAUPERIS—Filed June 16, 1959

State of California)
County of San Francisco) ss.

Vernon Kimbrough, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is a citizen of the United States by birth, of legal age, and a pauper person within the meaning of Section 1915(a) of Title 28, United States Code.

That the petitioner respectfully asks leave of the Court for permission to appeal in forma pauperis from the order of this Court dated June 2, 1959, denying motion to vacate the sentence on Count Three of the above entitled indictment.

In support hereof, the petitioner says further:

[fol. 15] 1. That he verily believes he has a just cause for action.

2. That he takes the appeal in good faith and his position is not frivolous.

/s/ Vernon Kimbrough
VERNON KIMBROUGH
Affiant

Sworn and subscribed before me this 10th day of June, 1959.

/s/ O. W. Blackwell
Associate Warden
U. S. Penitentiary
Alcatraz, California

Associate Warden Authorized by Act of July 7, 1955 to administer oaths (18 U.S.C. 4004).

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

[fol. 16] (File Endorsement Omitted)

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY
RICHMOND

(Title Omitted)

ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS—
June 16, 1959

The Clerk having reecived "Affidavit and Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis" from the defendant, Vernon Kimbrough, and the Court having considered same

It is ORDERED that the Motion be and is sustained and the defendant is permitted to file Notice of Appeal in forma pauperis.

/s/ H. Church Ford
Judge

June 16, 1959

• • • •

[fol. 17] UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

• • • •

NOTICE OF APPEAL—Filed July 13, 1959

Name and address of appellant: Vernon Kimbrough, Box 1273, Alcatraz, California

Concise statement of Judgment: Denial of Motion to Vacate Sentence (28 U.S.C.A. 2255)

Order appealed from: Denial of Motion to Vacate Sentence

Date of Order: June 2, 1959

Name of Judge: H. Church Ford

Notice is hereby given of appeal from the aforesaid order to the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, Cincinnati, Ohio.

/s/ Vernon Kimbrough
VERNON KIMBROUGH, Appellant

• • • •

[fol. 18] IN THE
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

• • • •

VERNON KIMBROUGH, APPELLANT

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLEE

ORDER

BEFORE: McAllister, Chief Judge, Miller, Circuit Judge, and Brooks, District Judge.

JUDGMENT—December 28, 1959

The above cause coming on to be heard on the appeal of Vernon Kimbrough from an order of the District Court denying appellant's motion to vacate sentence under Title 28, U.S.C.A. 2255, and the court being duly advised:

Now, therefore it is ordered, adjudged and decreed that the order of the District Court be, and is hereby affirmed. Blockbarger v. United States, 234 U.S. 299; Gore v. United States, 357 U.S. 386; Woody v. United States, 258 F.2nd 535 (C.A. 6).

Approved for entry:

/s/ Signature Illegible
United States Circuit Judge

[fol. 19] SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

• • • •

ORDER GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND PETITION FOR CERTIORARI—June 6, 1960

On petition for writ of Certiorari to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

On consideration of the motion for leave to proceed herein in forma pauperis and of the petition for writ of certiorari, it is ordered by this Court that the motion to proceed in forma pauperis be, and the same is hereby, granted; and that the petition for writ of certiorari be, and the same is hereby, granted. The case is transferred to the appellate docket as No. 987 and placed on the summary calendar.

June 6, 1960

☆ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1960 566562 366

FILE COPY

PETITION NOT PRINTED

FILED
NOV 4 1960
JAMES R. BROWNING

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 128

VERNON KIMBROUGH,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER

EDWARD L. BARRETT, JR.,
336 Law Building,
University of California,
Berkeley, California,
Counsel for Petitioner.

INDEX

SUBJECT INDEX

	Page
BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER:	
Opinion Below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Question Presented	2
Statute Involved	2
Statement	3
Argument	5
INTRODUCTION:	
I. The Rule of Lenity Should Be Applied and Sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Construed as Not Authorizing Separate Punishment of the Person With Respect to One Automobile in Order to Avoid the Risk of Irrational and Unjust Multiplication of Penalties in Interstate Automobile Theft Cases	7
II. The Legislative History of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Gives No Clear Indication That Congress Intended to Authorize Separate Punishments of the Same Person for Transporting and for Receiving and Concealing a Single Motor Vehicle	11
III. Application of the Rule of Lenity in the Interpretation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Would Be in Accord With the Trend of Recent Decisions in This Court	14
Summary of Argument	19
Conclusion	20

CITATIONS

Page

CASES:

Bell v. *United States*, 349 U.S. 81, 83 ..... 5, 7, 14
Blockburger v. *United States*, 284 U.S. 299 17
Gore v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 386 ..... 17, 18
Harris v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 19 ..... 17, 18
Heflin v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 415 ..... 5, 8, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
Ladner v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 169 ..... 5, 14
Prince v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 322 ..... 5, 15
United States v. *Turley*, 352 U.S. 407 11
Williams v. *United States*, 171 F.2d 952 (C.A. 5) 10
Woody v. *United States*, 258 F.2d 535 (C.A. 6) 18

STATUTES:

41 Stat. 324, 325 (National Motor Vehicle Theft Act) 2
18 U.S.C. 88 (present 18 U.S.C. 371) 3
18 U.S.C. 254 14
18 U.S.C. 408 (present 18 U.S.C. 2312 and 2313) 3
18 U.S.C. 2113 15
18 U.S.C. 2312 3
18 U.S.C. 2313 3
18 U.S.C. 2421 14
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 35 17

MISCELLANEOUS:

58 Cong. Rec. 5472 12
58 Cong. Rec. 6434 13
House Committee on the Judiciary, Report No. 312, accompanying H.R. 9203, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1 11
136 A.L.R. 948 8
28 A.L.R. 2d 1182 8
Clark & Marshall, *Law of Crime* (6th ed.) 8
Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rule 35 .. 17
Perkins, *Criminal Law* 8

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 128

VERNON KIMBROUGH,

Petitioner,

vs.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE PETITIONER

Opinion Below

The order of the Court of Appeals (R. 17) is reported at 272 F.2d 944.

Jurisdiction

The judgment of the Court of Appeals was entered December 28, 1959 (R. 17). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed January 22, 1960, and was granted on June 6, 1960 (R. 18). The jurisdiction of this Court rests upon 28 U.S.C. 1254 (1).

Question Presented

Whether petitioner could validly be given cumulative sentences under the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act for "transporting" a stolen automobile in interstate commerce and for receiving, concealing, and storing the same automobile.

Statute Involved

The National Motor Vehicle Theft Act (41 Stat. 324, 325) provided at the time of the prosecution involved in the case at bar as follows:

"SEC. 2. That when used in this Act:

(a) The term "motor vehicle" shall include an automobile, automobile truck, automobile wagon, motor cycle, or any other self-propelled vehicle not designed for running on rails;

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" as used in this Act shall include transportation from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 3. That whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 4. That whoever shall receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any motor vehicle, moving as, or which is a part of, or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

"SEC. 5. That any person violating this Act may be punished in any district in or through which such motor vehicle has been transported or removed by such offender."

The statute also then appeared consolidated into a single section as 18 U.S.C. 408. The relevant portions of the Act (sections 3 and 4) now appear as 18 U.S.C. 2312 and 2313.

Petitioner was also charged and sentenced under the conspiracy statute (then appearing as 18 U.S.C. 88) but no issue is raised concerning this charge.

Statement

In the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky, on April 28, 1941, petitioner, who was represented by counsel, pleaded guilty to an indictment in three counts (R. 5). Count one charged a conspiracy to transport in interstate commerce and to receive, conceal and store a stolen motor vehicle (R. 2, 3). Count two charged that on February 12, 1941, petitioner and his co-defendants transported from Atlanta, Georgia, to Owen County, Kentucky, "one 1941 Super DeLuxe Ford two-door sedan automobile, Motor No. 18-5929623"; that this automobile had been theretofore stolen from Roundtree Motor Co., in Lake City, Florida; that petitioner and his co-defendants knew that the automobile had been stolen (R. 3). Count three charged that "on and about the 19th day of January, 1941, and between said date and the 13th day of February, 1941," petitioner and his co-defendants did "receive, conceal, and store one 1941 grey Super DeLuxe

Ford two-door automobile, Motor No. 18-5929623" which had been stolen from the Roundtree Motor Co. in Lake City, Florida, on January 19, 1941, and which was moving as and was a part of interstate commerce, well knowing that said automobile had been so stolen (R. 3, 4). Petitioner was given consecutive sentences of two years on the conspiracy count and five years on each of the substantive counts, for a total of 12 years' imprisonment (R. 5, 6).

The present proceedings arose on April 9, 1959,[1] when petitioner filed in the District Court a motion to vacate the sentence imposed under the third count of the indictment on the ground that it charged the same offense as that for which he had been sentenced on the second count (R. 7, 8). On June 2, 1959, after receiving written briefs, the District Court denied the motion to vacate without opinion (R. 13).

Petitioner filed a notice of appeal on July 13, 1959 (R. 16). On December 28, 1959, the Court of Appeals entered its judgment affirming the order of the District Court (R. 17).

---

[1] The reasons for petitioner's continued imprisonment under this 1941 sentence do not appear in the record. As noted in the government's Brief in Opposition (p. 2, n. 1), petitioner was sentenced concurrently with his sentence under the Dyer Act charges to an additional five years for attempted escape. He was conditionally released in October, 1951. In 1955 he pleaded guilty to a charge of transporting stolen cars and was sentenced to imprisonment for five years. He has served the time imposed on the 1955 charge and is now in Alcatraz serving the time due for violation of his conditional release.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

ARGUMENT

Introduction

Petitioner is seeking to vacate the sentence which he is now serving on the ground that it appears from the face of the indictment and the judgment that the sentence is illegal. He makes no contention which requires an examination of anything other than the face of the indictment and the judgment. It seems clear that under these circumstances collateral attack is proper and, since petitioner is now in custody under the portion of the sentence which is attacked, there is no doubt as to the propriety of a motion under 28 U.S.C. 2255. See, *e.g., Heflin* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 415; *Ladner* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 169; *Prince* v. *United States,* 352 U.S. 322; *Bell* v. *United States,* 349 U.S. 81 (a case in which there was a plea of guilty).

In its Brief in Opposition (pp. 3, 4) the government argues, in effect, that the question of whether or not cumulative sentences were properly imposed in this case depends upon whether or not petitioner committed acts of receiving, concealing and storing which were "separate and distinct" from the act of transporting the automobile in interstate commerce. The government then concludes that petitioner has not presented an adequate factual foundation for his attack upon the sentences because by pleading guilty to all of the counts in the indictment he must be taken to have admitted the commission of such separate and distinct acts.

Petitioner's contention, however, is that whether or not separate and distinct acts may be involved, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act should be construed as not au-

thorizing the imposition of separate punishments upon a single individual with reference to a general course of conduct involving a single automobile. In this view the facts affirmatively appearing on the face of the indictment are sufficient to determine the legal issue presented.

An analysis of the indictment shows that petitioner was charged with transporting in count two and receiving, concealing and storing in count three the same automobile. It also shows that he was charged under each count with reference to the same general course of conduct, alleged to be as follows:

> (1) Petitioner and his co-defendants either (a) stole the automobile in Lake City, Florida, on January 19, 1941, or (b) acquired it on some unspecified date between January 19 and February 12 at some unspecified place from some unspecified person knowing that it had been stolen.
>
> (2) Petitioner and his co-defendants, from the date on which they acquired possession of the automobile until February 13, 1941, did "receive, conceal, and store" the automobile which was "then and there moving as, was a part of, and constituted interstate commerce."
>
> (3) Petitioner and his co-defendants on February 12, 1941, transported the automobile from Atlanta, Georgia, to Owen County, Kentucky.

That the government was charging petitioner with acts which were part of one general transaction or course of conduct with reference to the stolen automobile is made clear by the fact that the transportation count charged a single act of interstate movement occurring on February 12, 1941, while the receiving count charged a course

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

of conduct which both preceded and followed that act of transportation.

Petitioner contends that sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act should not be construed to authorize consecutive sentences under these facts, without regard to what he may have done with or to the automobile during the time it was in his possession. In the argument which follows it will be contended that this position is sound in principle, consistent with the legislative history of the statute, and supported by the trend of recent decisions of this Court in analogous situations.

I.

The Rule of Lenity Should Be Applied and Sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Construed as Not Authorizing Separate Punishment of One Person With Respect to One Automobile in Order to Avoid the Risk of Irrational and Unjust Multiplication of Penalties in Interstate Automobile Theft Cases.

In *Bell* v. *United States*, 349 U.S. 81, 83, this Court said: "When Congress leaves to the Judiciary the task of imputing to Congress an undeclared will, the ambiguity should be resolved in favor of lenity. And this not out of any sentimental consideration, or for want of sympathy with the purpose of Congress in proscribing evil or antisocial conduct. It may fairly be said to be a presupposition of our law to resolve doubts in the enforcement of a penal code against the imposition of a harsher punishment." The Court also said that ". . . doubts will be resolved against turning a single transaction into multiple offenses . . ." (349 U.S. at 84). In this portion of his brief petitioner will give his reasons for urging that the rule of lenity should be applied. In succeeding portions he will present his reasons for concluding that the legislative history of

the statute permits application of the rule of lenity and for concluding that such application would be in accord with recent decisions of this Court.

In closely analogous situations to that involved in this case the general criminal law enforced in the states, both common law and statutory, does not permit multiplication of punishment. A person guilty of larceny is regarded as guilty of only one crime and is subjected to only one punishment no matter what he does with the stolen goods. The fact that he may conceal them, or use them, or store them, or sell them, does not constitute the commission of additional crimes for which additional punishments may be meted out. (See generally Perkins, *Criminal Law*, Ch. 4.) This result is proper because in the generality of instances concealment is inherent in the act of larceny and the whole purpose of the larceny is to use or sell or otherwise dispose of the goods stolen. The problems in state law have been those of determining whether multiple offenses result when property is stolen from several owners at the same time (see cases collected in 28 A.L.R. 2d 1182) or when there is a series of takings from the same owner over a period of time (see cases collected in 136 A.L.R. 948). Neither of these problems is, of course, involved in the case at bar. In a more closely analogous situation, however, the common law and the normal state law rule is that a person may not be convicted of and punished for both the crimes of larceny and of receiving with respect to the same stolen goods. See Perkins, *Criminal Law*, p. 275; Clark and Marshall, *Law of Crimes* (6th ed.), p. 858. A similar rule was applied by this Court in *Heflin* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 415, in holding that multiple punishment could not be imposed for robbing a bank and for receiving the property obtained in the robbery.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

The situation under the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act is basically similar to that involved in an ordinary larceny prosecution. True, Congress did not attempt (because of constitutional limitations) to make criminal the original act of theft. Instead, it defined the basic crime as transporting in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle knowing the same to be stolen. As in larceny cases, it seems inherent in the proscribed act that the transporter will be attempting to conceal the automobile and that he will be transporting it for the purpose either of using it or of bartering, selling or disposing of it. Hence it would seem desirable in principle that the thief who takes a motor vehicle across a state line should not be subjected to a multiplication of severe penalties for acts which are a normal concomitant of both the larceny and the transporting and for which he would not be subjected to multiple penalties under state law if he did not take the vehicle into interstate commerce.

Furthermore, acceptance of the government's argument that the commission of separate acts can result in the commission of separate offenses under the statute even though a single automobile is involved would result in giving to the prosecutor and the trial court almost unlimited discretion in carving separate crimes out of what is essentially a unitary criminal transaction. Assume, for example, that the underlying facts in the case at bar were as follows: (1) Petitioner "received" the automobile in Florida from the thief knowing it to be stolen; (2) he drove it into Georgia and hid it overnight in a barn; (3) he drove it into Tennessee where he changed license plates; (4) he drove it into Alabama and used it in the commission of a burglary; (5) he drove it into Georgia where he repainted it; and (6) he drove it into Kentucky where he was arrested. Would the United States Attorney have discretion to charge and, on a finding of guilty on each,

would the judge have discretion to impose consecutive five-year sentences for each of the following crimes: (1) receiving the automobile in Florida while it was moving in interstate commerce; (2) transporting from Florida to Georgia; (3) concealing in Georgia; (4) transporting to Tennessee; (5) concealing in Tennessee; (6) transporting to Alabama; (7) concealing in Alabama; (8) transporting to Georgia; (9) concealing in Georgia; (10) transporting to Kentucky; and (11) concealing in Kentucky? That such a multiplication of offenses is not wholly fanciful is suggested by *Williams* v. *United States*, 171 F.2d 952 (C.A. 5), certiorari denied, 337 U.S. 920, where the defendant was charged in the first count with transporting a stolen automobile from Louisiana to Oklahoma via Arkansas on November 8 and in the second count with transporting the same automobile from Louisiana to Arkansas on November 11. Consecutive sentences were imposed on the two counts and affirmed on appeal.

But even if the government's contention is limited to permitting only two charges with respect to each car stolen —one for transporting and one for receiving, concealing and storing—it seems undesirable to accept that contention in the absence of the clearest statutory direction. Why should the man who steals or receives a car in one state and transports it to another be subjected, in the discretion of the prosecutor and the court, to the imposition of two consecutive five-year sentences while the professional receiver to whom he sells the automobile will, if he disposes of the vehicle within the state where he receives it, be subjected only to a maximum sentence of five years on a single count? Shouldn't the statute instead be interpreted to impose a single penalty, and only a single penalty, upon each person who is involved with any one stolen motor vehicle which is transported in interstate commerce?

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

II.

The Legislative History of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Gives No Clear Indication That Congress Intended to Authorize Separate Punishments of the Same Person for Transporting and for Receiving and Concealing a Single Motor Vehicle.

The legislative history (much of which was referred to by this Court in *United States* v. *Turley*, 352 U.S. 407) is quickly set out. A report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, H. Rep. No. 312, accompanying H.R. 9203, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., pp. 1, 4, discussed the purpose of the bill in its opening and closing paragraphs which read as follows:

> "The Congress of the United States can scarcely enact any law at this session that is more needed than the bill herein recommended, and that has for its purpose the providing of severe punishment of those guilty of the stealing of automobiles in interstate or foreign commerce. There has been and is now a most widespread demand for such a law. State laws upon the subject have been inadequate to meet the evil. Thieves steal automobiles and take them from one State to another and ofttimes have associates in this crime who receive and sell the stolen machines. The losses to the people of the United States by reason of this stealing amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. It is getting worse. It is getting so now that it is difficult for the owners of the cheaper cars to obtain theft insurance, due to the great loss that insurance companies have sustained. During the past year automobile theft insurance on this class of cars has increased 100 percent. It is automobiles of that price that are generally stolen. Automobile

thieves who make a specialty of this crime do not steal many of the higher priced cars, the reason being of course that they are not so easily sold. . .

• • • • •

"The purpose of the proposed law is to suppress crime in interstate commerce. Automobiles admittedly are tangible property capable of being transported in interstate commerce. The larceny of automobiles is made a crime under the laws of all the States in the Union. No good reason exists why Congress, invested with the power to regulate commerce among the several States, should not provide that such commerce should not be polluted by the carrying of stolen property from one State to another. Congress is the only power competent to legislate upon this evil, and the purpose of this bill is to crush it, with the penalties attached."

The foregoing report gives little help in determining Congressional intent on the issue in the case at bar. It is of some significance, however, that the House Committee appeared to be thinking of reaching different persons, rather than multiplying punishments on single persons, when it included the sentence: "Thieves steal automobiles and take them from one State to another and ofttimes have associates in this crime who receive and sell the stolen machines." This emphasis was repeated in the House debate by Congressman Dyer, sponsor of the legislation (58 Cong. Rec. 5472):

"[The bill] provides, gentlemen, for only two things. Section 3 provides for the punishment of a thief stealing a car and transporting it from one State to another. Section 4 provides for the receipt of the stolen car by thieves in another State for the purpose of selling and disposing of it."

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

The debate in the Senate was no more enlightening. Senator Cummins discussed the two separate sections of the Act as follows (58 Cong. Rec. 6434):

> "... The practice is to steal an automobile close to a State line and run it across the State line. The first section [§3] is intended to punish anyone who does that thing, knowing the vehicle to have been stolen. The further practice is, if possible, to dispose of the vehicle to some other party, confederate or otherwise, when it gets across the State line, and section 4 is for the purpose of punishing a man who barters or sells or disposes of the property with intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, or if he conceals it knowing it to have been stolen. I think that would probably embrace every case that could be reached."

This statement is subject to conflicting interpretations but, especially in view of the last sentence, it would appear reasonable to understand the Senator as saying only that section 3 is intended to punish the transporter and, because it is customary for a transporter often to dispose of the vehicle to another party after crossing the state line, section 4 is included to impose a punishment on the latter party if, knowing the vehicle to be stolen, he receives, conceals, sells or otherwise disposes of it.

In short, it would be a reasonable interpretation of the statute, in the light of its legislative history, to find that it was intended to authorize punishment of each person involved in an interstate automobile theft, whether his role was transporting, receiving, concealing, storing, bartering, selling or disposing, but that it was not intended to authorize multiple punishment of any person who performed more than one of these roles with respect to a single vehicle. Hence this is an appropriate case for the application of the rule of lenity.

III.

Application of the Rule of Lenity in the Interpretation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act Would Be in Accord With the Trend of Recent Decisions in This Court.

Recent cases in this Court have indicated a trend toward application of the rule of lenity to avoid multiple punishment for a single criminal act or course of criminal conduct in the absence of clear Congressional intent to the contrary. These cases have dealt both with problems arising when Congress has made an act a crime and several such acts are committed contemporaneously and with problems (more closely related to the case at bar) where Congress has made criminal separate portions of a criminal act or course of conduct and one person commits acts which fall within more than one of the penal provisions.

Illustrative of the first type of case are *Bell* v. *United States*, 349 U.S. 81 and *Ladner* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 169. In *Bell* the question was whether a man who transported two women on the same trip in the same vehicle could be subjected to cumulative punishment under two counts charging two violations of the Mann Act, 18 U.S.C. 2421. In the absence of any clear statutory intent to the contrary, the Court applied the rule of lenity to forbid multiple punishment. In *Ladner* the defendant received cumulative sentences for assaulting two federal officers with a deadly weapon in violation of former 18 U.S.C. 254. The Court held that if only a single shot were fired by the defendant, the rule of lenity should be applied to forbid cumulative punishment. There is in these cases, of course, an emphasis upon the singleness of the act and of the intent of the defendant and a similar emphasis would be appropriate in a Dyer Act case if the question were whether a defendant could receive cumulative punishment

POOR COPY

for transporting or receiving or concealing or selling two cars at the same time.

Other cases demonstrate, however, that application of the rule of lenity does not depend on showing a single act where Congress has made criminal separate portions of a course of criminal conduct which may extend over a period of time and occur in more than one place. Illustrative here are *Prince* v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 322, and *Heflin* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 415, both involving the Federal Bank Robbery Act (18 U.S.C. 2113). In *Prince*, the defendant, as the result of a single hold-up of a bank, was charged with entering the bank with intent to commit a robbery and with the bank robbery itself. He was given a sentence of 15 years for entering and 20 years for robbing to be served consecutively. Examining the legislative history this Court concluded that when Congress created the crime of entering it did not intend to permit a doubling of the punishment in every bank robbery situation. The Congressional motive was seen to be that of providing for punishment of a person who enters a bank with the intent of committing a robbery but is frustrated before completing the basic crime of robbery.

More closely related to the problem in the case at bar is *Heflin* where the Congressional purpose in dividing a criminal course of conduct into separate crimes was found to be to insure that each individual involved in any of the separate portions of that course of conduct should be criminally punished rather than to authorize a multiplication of penalties upon any single offender. The defendant was charged with and convicted of committing a bank robbery with force and violence in violation of subsection (d) of 18 U.S.C. 2113 and with receiving, possessing, concealing, storing, and disposing of the stolen money in violation of subsection (c) of the same section. Consecutive sentences were im-

posed. After examining the legislative history this Court concluded that the separate penalty imposed for receiving, concealing, etc., ". . . was not designed to increase the punishment for him who robs a bank but only to provide punishment for those who receive the loot from the robber. We find no purpose of Congress to pyramid penalties for lesser offenses following the robbery. It may be true that in logic those who divide up the loot following a robbery receive from robbers and thus multiply the offense. But in view of the legislative history of subsection (c) we think Congress was trying to reach a new group of wrongdoers, not to multiply the offense of the bank robbers themselves." (358 U.S. 419, 420.)

Although they arise under different statutes with separate legislative histories, the problems involved in *Heflin* and those in the case at bar are so strikingly similar that, it is submitted, identical results should be reached. In each case Congress has defined a basic criminal act—bank robbery in the one case, transporting of a stolen automobile in interstate commerce in the other. In each case Congress has sought to impose punishment upon those persons who knowingly receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of the fruits of the basic crime—the loot from the robbery in one case, the stolen car which has been transported in the other. In each case the person who commits the basic crime in the very process of so doing commits acts which constitute a violation of the proscription against receiving, concealing, etc., if it is held applicable. In each case Congress has not clearly indicated an intent to impose double punishment upon the person who commits the basic crime. Here then, as in *Heflin,* the conclusion should be that a single person cannot be separately punished both for transporting and for receiving with respect to the same automobile.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

Heflin also constitutes an answer to the contention made made by the government in its Brief in Opposition that the rule of lenity is limited to those cases where a single act is involved. In *Heflin* a majority of the Court held that the case must be taken as a motion under Rule 35 of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure to correct an "illegal sentence"—a motion which limits consideration to the face of the indictment. Hence, the case was in the same posture as the one at bar and the sentence was adjudged illegal on its face. Yet in *Heflin*, as here, it would have been possible to conjure up the possibility that the robbers had committed separate acts with respect to the loot. In fact, the Court mentions the possibility that the robbers may have gotten together after the robbery and divided up the loot—clearly a separate act committed at a separate time and place and not inherent in the act of robbing. Still the Court held that with respect to a single robbery punishment could not be separately imposed on one person both for the robbery and for receiving—apparently without regard to the possibility that the acts which constituted a violation of the receiving section might have been separated in time and place from the robbery and, in fact, might have been the result of separate criminal impulses.

Petitioner realizes that there are other recent cases in this Court which, in the sense that they permit double punishment to arise from a single act or transaction, point in a different direction. It is submitted, however, that these cases are sufficiently distinct both with reference to legislative history and factual background as to preclude the necessity for discussing them here. Perhaps, however, a word should be said about the narcotics cases. *Blockburger* v. *United States*, 284 U.S. 299; *Gore* v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 386; and *Harris* v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 19. In finding a Congressional intent to multiply punishments in those cases the Court was dealing both with a significantly dif-

ferent factual situation and with a quite distinct legislative history than is involved in the interpretation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act.

In defining the separate offenses involved in the narcotics cases Congress was not seeking to reach different persons involved in an illegal transaction. Instead, Congress was making criminal separate acts in a context where one person might commit all, or less than all, of those acts. Thus, in the course of handling narcotics a defendant might violate only the provision against dealing with narcotics other than in the original stamped package, or only the provision against selling without a written order, or only the provision against receiving, concealing, etc., any narcotic drug knowing it to have been illegally imported; or the defendant might violate all three of these provisions. Thus in *Gore* he was charged with violating all three; in *Harris* only with two. Each of these provisions came into the statute at separate times, and a Congressional intent to deal with increasing severity with narcotics offenders was discernible. Thus, the problem before the Court in the narcotic cases, in contrast to the problem before it in *Heflin,* was so strikingly different from that in the case at bar as to make them clearly distinguishable.

Petitioner is aware that the cases in the courts of appeals have uniformly permitted separate punishments under sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act. These cases, however, should not be persuasive here since in each of them the point was disposed of without the detailed examination of legislative history and of policy which is necessary to a solution of the problem under the standards set by this Court in the cases discussed above. See *Woody* v. *United States,* 258 F.2d 535 (C.A. 6), affirmed by an equally divided Court, 359 U.S. 118, and the earlier cases cited therein.

Summary of Argument

Petitioner contends that in the spirit of the rule of lenity and in the light of general criminal law traditions sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act should not be construed as authorizing the imposition of consecutive sentences upon one person for transporting and for receiving, concealing and storing a single automobile as a part of one general course of conduct.

Petitioner contends that the legislative history shows no affirmative intent of Congress to authorize such cumulative punishment. In fact, it would be quite consistent both with the face of the statute and with all of the available legislative history to conclude that the Congressional purpose was merely to impose a single punishment upon each person involved in any portion of an interstate automobile theft transaction and not to permit a multiplication of penalties upon any single individual who committed more than one of the proscribed acts.

Petitioner contends that acceptance of the interpretation of the statute urged by him would be in accord with the trend of recent decisions in this Court, and particularly in accord with the conclusion reached in a closely analogous situation in *Heflin* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 415.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the judgments below be reversed and the cause remanded for the purpose of vacating and correcting the sentence in accordance with petitioner's motion.

Respectfully submitted,

EDWARD L. BARRETT, JR.,
336 Law Building,
University of California,
Berkeley, California,
Counsel for Petitioner.

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES

INDEX

	Page
Opinion below	1
Jurisdiction	1
Question presented	1
Statutes involved	2
Statement	3
Summary of argument	5
Argument	9
I. This case does not involve a single act or transaction	10
II. Separate acts of transportation and of concealment are subject to separate punishment	14
A. The language of the statute	14
B. The legislative history	18
C. The judicial decisions	22
Conclusion	30

CITATIONS

Cases:

Aaronson v. *United States*, 175 F. 2d 41	17
Albrecht v. *United States*, 273 U.S. 1	17
Austin v. *United States*, 224 F. 2d 273	24
Batson v. *Squier*, 146 F. 2d 264, certiorari denied, 324 U.S. 874	23
Bell v. *United States*, 349 U.S. 81	8, 26
Burton v. *United States*, 202 U.S. 344	17
Carpenter v. *Hudspeth*, 112 F. 2d 126	17
Carroll v. *Sanford*, 167 F. 2d 878	17
Carroll v. *United States*, 174 F. 2d 412, certiorari denied, 338 U.S. 874	17
Chrysler v. *Zerbst*, 81 F. 2d 975	23, 24
Crawford v. *United States*, 214 F. 2d 313	24
Cuddy, In re, 131 U.S. 280	11
Doll v. *Johnston*, 95 F. 2d 838, certiorari denied, 304 U.S. 574	23, 24
Donaldson v. *United States*, 82 F. 2d 680	14

577048—60——1

Cases—Continued Page

Gore v. *United States*, 357 U.S. 386 ..... 27, 28
Goto v. *Lane*, 265 U.S. 393 12
Heflin v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 415 ..... 8, 9, 17, 28, 29
Hull, Ex parte, 312 U.S. 546 11
Inman v. *United States*, 243 F. 2d 256, certiorari denied, 358 U.S. 888 17
Jackson v. *Hudspeth*, 111 F. 2d 128 ..... 23, 24
Knewel v. *Egan*, 268 U.S. 442 12
Ladner v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 169 27
Lindsay v. *United States*, 134 F. 2d 960, certiorari denied, 319 U.S. 763 ..... 23, 24, 25
Madsen v. *United States*, 165 F. 2d 507 24
Milanovich v. *United States*, 275 F. 2d 716, pending on writ of certiorari, No. 79, this Term 17
Phillips v. *United States*, 206 F. 2d 923 15
Pifer v. *United States*, 158 F. 2d 867, certiorari denied, 329 U.S. 815 24
Prince v. *United States*, 352 U.S. 322 ..... 8, 28, 29
Record v. *Hudspeth*, 126 F. 2d 215, certiorari denied, 316 U.S. 703 23
Thomas v. *United States*, 249 F. 2d 429, certiorari denied, 355 U.S. 936 17
United States v. *Di Carlo*, 64 F. 2d 15 14
United States v. *Dunbar*, 149 F. 2d 151, certiorari denied, 325 U.S. 889 17
United States v. *Guido*, 200 F. 2d 105 14
United States v. *Hampden*, 294 Fed. 345 ..... 24, 25
United States v. *Runion*, 47 F. Supp. 594 24
United States v. *Spradley*, 65 F. Supp. 136, affirmed, 162 F. 2d 203 24
Woody v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 118 ..... 8, 22, 23
York v. *United States*, 299 Fed. 778 23

Statutes:

Federal Bank Robbery Act, 48 Stat. 783, as amended 28
National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, 41 Stat. 324, 18 U.S.C. (1940 ed.) 408:
Sec. 3 ..... 2, 3, 7, 8, 14, 18, 21, 22, 27
Sec. 4 ..... 2, 3, 7, 8, 14, 18, 21, 22, 27
59 Stat. 536 21
18 U.S.C. 111 (formerly 18 U.S.C. 254) 27
18 U.S.C. 2312 ..... 2, 7, 14, 15, 16
18 U.S.C. 2313 ..... 2, 3, 7, 14, 15, 16
28 U.S.C. 2255 ..... 4, 10

Miscellaneous:

	Page
56 A.L.R. 2d 1321	24
56 A.L.R. 2d 1379	24
58 Cong. Rec. 5472	19
58 Cong. Rec. 6434	20
H. Rep. No. 312, 66th Cong., 1st Sess	19
H. Rep. No. 866, 79th Cong., 1st Sess	21
S. Rep. No. 40, 79th Cong., 1st Sess	21

POOR COPY

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1960

No. 128

VERNON KIMBROUGH, PETITIONER

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES

OPINION BELOW

The order of the court of appeals (R. 17) is reported at 272 F. 2d 944.

JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on December 28, 1959 (R. 17). The petition for a writ of certiorari was filed on January 22, 1960, and was granted on June 6, 1960 (R. 18). The jurisdiction of this Court rests upon 28 U.S.C. 1254(1).

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether consecutive sentences could properly be imposed upon two counts of an indictment charging

that petitioner and two other persons (1) transported a stolen motor vehicle in interstate commerce, and (2) received, stored, and concealed the same vehicle, when the indictment clearly indicates that these were separate acts.

STATUTES INVOLVED

The National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, 41 Stat. 324, 325, 18 U.S.C. (1940 ed.) 408, which was in effect at the time of the indictment, provided:

* * * * *

> SEC. 3. That whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.
>
> SEC. 4. That whoever shall receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any motor vehicle, moving as, or which is a part of, or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

* * * * *

Sections 3 and 4 are now embodied in 18 U.S.C. 2312 and 2313, respectively, which provide in substantially the same language as follows:

18 U.S.C. 2312:

> *Transportation of stolen vehicles*
>
> Whoever transports in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle or aircraft, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be fined not

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

18 U.S.C. 2313:

Sale or receipt of stolen vehicles

Whoever receives, conceals, stores, barters, sells, or disposes of any motor vehicle or aircraft, moving as, or which is a part of, or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

STATEMENT

An indictment returned in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Kentucky on April 28, 1941, charged petitioner, Edwin Wade Sharpe, and William Edward Sanders, with violations of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act (R. 2–4). Count 2 charged that the defendants on and about February 12, 1941, transported in interstate commerce from Atlanta, Georgia, to Owen County, Kentucky, a Ford automobile which had been stolen in Lake City, Florida, the defendants knowing that the Ford had been stolen (in violation of Section 3 of the Act, now 18 U.S.C. 2312, *supra,* pp. 2–3) (R. 3). Count 3 charged that, on and about January 19, 1941, and from that date to February 13, 1941, the defendants received, concealed, and stored in the Eastern District of Kentucky the same Ford which had been stolen in Florida on January 19 and was moving in interstate commerce (in violation of Section 4 of the Act, now 18 U.S.C. 2313, *supra,* pp. 2–3) (R. 3–4). Count 1 charged a conspiracy

to transport in interstate commerce vehicles which were known to have been stolen and to receive, conceal, and store such vehicles, and alleged the facts stated in counts 2 and 3 as overt acts (R. 2–3). Petitioner, who was represented by counsel, pleaded guilty to all three counts. He was given consecutive sentences of imprisonment for two years on count 1, five years on count 2, and five years on count 3—a total of twelve years (R. 5).

The present proceedings arose on April 9, 1959,[1] when petitioner filed a motion pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2255 to vacate the sentence on count 3 for receiving, concealing, and storing the stolen automobile, on the ground that it charged the same offense as that for which he had been sentenced on count 2, the transportation count (R. 7–8). After considering the briefs filed by the parties (R. 9–12), the district court denied the motion to vacate sentence (R. 13). On appeal, the court of appeals unanimously affirmed the order denying the motion (R. 17).

---

[1] Petitioner was in prison in 1959 and is still today because of the following circumstances: At the same time that he was sentenced to twelve years' imprisonment in 1941 for violation of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, he was also given an additional five-year sentence for attempted escape. He was conditionally released in October 1951. In 1955 he pleaded guilty to a new charge of transporting stolen cars and was sentenced to imprisonment for five years. He finished serving this sentence in 1958. He then began to serve the remainder of the seventeen-year sentence imposed in 1941 since his new offense (in 1955) violated the terms of his conditional release in 1951.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

I

Since petitioner pleaded guilty, the issue whether he could properly be given consecutive sentences for transportation and for receipt, concealment, and storage of a stolen automobile in interstate commerce must be determined from the face of the indictment. Petitioner does not deny that the indictment indicates that the acts of concealment were in addition to the transportation. But he does assume that the indictment shows one general transaction or course of conduct with reference to the stolen automobile. Count 3, however, charges concealment of the automobile in the Eastern District of Kentucky from January 19, 1941, the same day when the automobile was stolen in Florida, to February 13, 1941. Count 2 charges that the automobile was transported from Georgia to Kentucky on February 12. The indictment therefore makes clear that the transportation alleged in count 2 is not the original transportation from Florida to Kentucky since the automobile was already in Kentucky immediately following the theft on January 19. In these circumstances, it does not seem, and there is no reason to assume, that the transportation charged in the indictment was related to the concealment of the automobile which was undertaken immediately after the theft almost a month before the transportation charged in count 2.

Moreover, the indictment must be construed in the manner which is most favorable to the government. This is based on the principle that a person attacking

577048—60——2

a judgment has the burden to establish the facts supporting his claim. Here, the only relevant fact is the indictment itself, and, insofar as it is ambiguous, petitioner has failed to sustain his burden of proof. Further, it is established that when an indictment purports to charge a federal offense, it cannot be collaterally attacked unless it appears from the indictment's face that no offense could possibly have been committed.

In short, the indictment itself strongly suggests that the concealment and transportation were separate and unrelated acts—*i.e.*, that the concealment related to the original theft in January and that the transportation in February was separate from the prior theft and concealment. At the least, when the indictment is construed in the manner most favorable to the government, it charges two separate and unrelated acts.

Petitioner's position is therefore that "whether or not separate and distinct acts may be involved, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act should be construed as not authorizing the imposition of separate punishments upon a single individual with reference to a general course of conduct involving a single automobile." Such a broad concept of merger of separate acts is contrary to the language of the Act, which make the acts of transportation and concealment separately punishable. Where, as here, the transportation is separate from the concealment and the theft, and the offenses are disparate in time, impulse, and purpose, the separate crimes are separately punishable. The more difficult factual situation

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

where the transportation and concealment are part of a common transaction is not now before this Court.

II

A. Sections 3 and 4 of the Act, now 18 U.S.C. 2312 and 2313, provide for two separate offenses. Section 2312 punishes anyone who transports a stolen vehicle, knowing it to have been stolen; Section 2313 punishes anyone who "receives, conceals, stores, barters, sells, or disposes of" such a vehicle. Of the acts specified by Section 2313, only "receives" would necessarily be involved in the transportation itself. The other acts could occur before, during, or after a particular interstate transportation, or not at all. Moreover, the term "whoever," which introduces Section 2313, is of the broadest possible coverage and shows that Congress intended to punish anyone who separately does the acts which Section 2313 prohibits, whether he is the transporter or someone else. The intent of Congress, as shown by the language of the statute to punish separately the activities specified in Sections 2312 and 2313, is particularly applicable to this case where, as we have shown, the transportation and concealment were separate acts.

B. The legislative history of the Act does not conclusively answer the issue before the Court. It does, however, show that Congress considered the offenses covered by the Act as extremely serious and intended to punish in Sections 3 and 4 two distinct offenses involving stolen vehicles. Thus, the legislative history lends some support that Congress intended to punish

separate violations of both sections of the Act even when the same person had committed both offenses.

C. This Court in *Woody* v. *United States,* 359 U.S. 118, affirmed, by an equally divided Court, a holding of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (258 F. 2d 535) that a person may be separately punished for transporting and for receiving and concealing the same automobile in violation of Sections 3 and 4 of the Act. In *Woody,* as here, the acts of transportation and concealment were separate from the transportation. Other lower federal court decisions have uniformly held that violations of both Sections 3 and 4 of the Act are separately punishable even when only one act or transaction is involved.

The so-called doctrine of lenity does not apply to situations such as that involved here, where different acts at different times are involved. Under *Bell* v. *United States,* 349 U.S. 81, 83–84, the rule of lenity is limited to the situation where the offenses involve a single transaction; it is a rule "against turning a single transaction into multiple offenses" where the Congressional intent is not clear. The decision in *Heflin* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 415 (that a bank robber could not be separately punished for receiving the money he had helped to steal), not only turns on the particular history of the bank robbery statute—"a unique statute of limited purpose" (*Prince* v. *United States,* 352 U.S. 322, 325)—but involves a situation where there was a common-law conceptual difficulty in separating the receiving from the stealing. There is no such conceptual difficulty here where

POOR COPY

the concealment and the transportation could be, and the indictment indicates that they were, separate in time and presumably in purpose. Moreover, the Court indicated in *Heflin* that it was considering "multiple aspects of the same criminal act." On the other hand, in order to sustain petitioner's position, it would be necessary to hold that acts of concealment, which are distinct from and in addition to the transportation, are not subject to separate punishment. Such an interpretation would be contrary to the words of the statute, its legislative history, the decisions of the lower federal courts, and of this Court.

ARGUMENT

Since petitioner pleaded guilty, the issue whether he could properly be given consecutive sentences for transportation and also for receipt, concealment, and storage of a stolen automobile in interstate commerce must be determined from the face of indictment. The indictment here shows that the acts charged in count 3 were completely separate from the transportation alleged in count 2, even though the same automobile was involved. Therefore, as we will show, the acts charged in the two counts constitute separate offenses which are separately punishable just as two separate acts of transportation of the same stolen automobile would be. Whether the transportation and concealment would be separately punishable if they were part of a single transaction—an entirely different factual situation—is a more difficult issue which is not now before this Court.

I

THIS CASE DOES NOT INVOLVE A SINGLE ACT OR TRANSACTION

On several preliminary matters, there is no dispute between petitioner and the government. The government does not dispute the right of petitioner to raise by collateral attack under 28 U.S.C. 2255 the question as to whether, on the face of the indictment, consecutive sentences could properly be imposed on count 2 charging transportation and count 3 charging receipt, concealment, and storage of a stolen automobile in interstate commerce. On the other hand, petitioner does not deny that, on this record, in view of his plea of guilty, consideration of the issue must be determined from the face of the indictment. Nor does he deny that the face of the indictment demonstrates that the acts of receiving, concealing, and storing were in addition to and beyond the transportation charged in count 2.

Petitioner does assume that the indictment shows one general transaction or course of conduct with reference to the stolen automobile. Beyond the fact that the same automobile was involved, we do not believe that even this assumption can be made. The concealment count charges concealment of the automobile in the Eastern District of Kentucky from on or about January 19, 1941, the same day when the automobile was stolen in Florida, to February 13, 1941 (count 3) (R. 4). The transportation count charges that the automobile was transported from Atlanta, Georgia, to Owen County, Kentucky, on or about

POOR COPY

February 12, 1941 (count 2) (R. 3). The indictment therefore makes clear that the transportation alleged in count 2 is not the original transportation from Florida to Kentucky since the automobile was already in Kentucky immediately following the theft on or about January 19. Rather, the indictment indicates that the automobile was first transported from Florida to Kentucky, was subsequently transported from Kentucky to Georgia some time between January 19 and February 12, and then almost a month after the original transportation to Kentucky was transported from Georgia back to Kentucky. In these circumstances, there is no reason to assume that the transportation (on or about February 12) from Georgia back to Kentucky was related to the concealment of the automobile in Kentucky immediately after the theft on January 19—particularly since the great majority of the period of concealment, January 19 to February 13, occurred prior to the charged transportation from Georgia to Kentucky on and about February 12.

Moreover, we submit that the indictment must be construed in the manner which is most favorable to the government. This Court has held that, when a defendant attacks a judgment, the burden is on him to show the facts supporting his claim. *In re Cuddy,* 131 U.S. 280, 286; *Ex parte Hull,* 312 U.S. 546, 551. By pleading guilty, petitioner removed the necessity for the government to prove the facts underlying the indictment, and made the indictment the sole relevant fact supporting his collateral attack which was initiated eighteen years later. Insofar as

the indictment, *i.e.*, the only relevant fact, is ambiguous, petitioner has failed to sustain his burden of proof. Further, it is established that, when an indictment purports to charge a federal offense, it cannot be challenged after conviction, unless it appears from the indictment's face that no offense could possibly have been committed. *Goto* v. *Lane,* 265 U.S. 393; see also *Knewel* v. *Egan,* 268 U.S. 442. By a parity of reasoning, it cannot be assumed on collateral attack that two counts of an indictment which do not on their face necessarily relate to one act or transaction nevertheless do so.

In short, the indictment itself strongly suggests that the concealment and transportation were separate and unrelated acts—that the concealment related to the original theft and that the transportation had nothing to do with the theft or the concealment, but was for a subsequent separate purpose. At the least, when the indictment is construed in the manner most favorable to the government, it charges two separate and unrelated acts. The only connection between the transportation and concealment is that they occurred within the continuous period when petitioner and his codefendants had the stolen automobile under their control.

Petitioner's position therefore has to be, and in fact is, the very broad one that "whether or not separate and distinct acts may be involved, the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act should be construed as not authorizing the imposition of separate punishments upon a single individual with reference to a general course of conduct involving a single automo-

POOR COPY

bile" (Pet. Br. 5–6). We think this concept of the merger of separate acts is contrary to the intent of Congress and to the normal interpretation of federal criminal statutes. The issue thus posed does not call for application of the so-called "rule of lenity" which relates to the question of whether multiple offenses shall be deemed to have arisen out of a single transaction (see *infra*, pp. 26–29). The acts of transportation and concealment were made separately punishable by Congress, and if there is any ambiguity about the intent of Congress at all, it relates only to the situation where the acts of concealment are wholly encompassed in the transportation charged.

Where, as here, the transportation is something separate and apart from the concealment, we think it is clear that the separately proscribed act of transportation may be punished separately from the separately proscribed act of concealment. If someone stole the automobile in Florida and brought it to Kentucky, held it in Kentucky for a month, and then drove it from Kentucky to California, the transportation from Florida to Kentucky, and the transportation from Kentucky to California, would plainly be separate offenses separately punishable. Otherwise, an accused fortunate enough to avoid apprehension for several years could commit an unlimited number of offenses of transporting and concealing in many different states, and still be punished only to the same extent as a one-transaction violator. We think that the situation is the same here where the

577048 60 - 3

indictment must be construed to charge a transportation which is something separate from the concealment or the theft. Since the offenses are disparate in time, in impulse, and in purpose, the separate crimes are separately punishable.

II

SEPARATE ACTS OF TRANSPORTATION AND OF CONCEALMENT ARE SUBJECT TO SEPARATE PUNISHMENT

A. THE LANGUAGE OF THE STATUTE

The two sections here involved (Sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, 41 Stat. 324, 325, now 18 U.S.C. 2312 and 2313, *supra*, pp. 2–3) clearly make provision for two separate offenses. Section 2312 punishes anyone who transports in interstate commerce a stolen motor vehicle, knowing it to have been stolen; Section 2313 punishes anyone who "receives, conceals, stores, barters, sells, or disposes of" a stolen vehicle moving as part of interstate commerce, knowing it to have been stolen.

On their face, the two sections punish separate activities. Thus, the activities punishable under Section 2313 obviously can take place without any transportation. For example, concealment can involve such affirmative acts of wrongdoing as changing motor numbers, executing false bills of sale, repainting, and major repairs. These acts, which are entirely distinct from transportation, have been held to be in themselves offenses under Section 2313. *Donaldson* v. *United States*, 82 F. 2d 680 (C.A. 7); *United States* v. *Di Carlo*, 64 F. 2d 15 (C.A. 2); *United States* v. *Guido*, 200 F. 2d 105 (C.A. 2);

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

Phillips v. *United States,* 206 F. 2d 923 (C.A. 10). Of the various acts specified by Section 2313, only "receives" would *necessarily* be involved in the transportation itself. "Conceal," "barter," and "store" could occur before, during, or after a particular interstate transportation, or not at all. "Sell" and "dispose of" would usually occur, if at all, after some interstate transportation in order to be federally punishable. Conversely, the transportation punishable under Section 2312 can obviously occur without any of the activities mentioned in Section 2313. It is thus evident from the face of the statute that Congress intended in Section 2313 to punish acts which were separate from, and in addition to, the interstate transportation, and which would normally require a criminal impulse separate and different from the act of transporting.

There is further evidence from the statute that Congress did not intend the acts punishable under Sections 2312 and 2313 to be alternate ways of committing the same crime. The word "whoever," which introduces Section 2313 (*supra,* p. 3), is of the broadest possible coverage. It includes the person who does the transporting if, in addition to transporting, he commits any of the several acts which Section 2313 punishes. Indeed, if Congress had intended Section 2313 to apply only to someone other than the transporter—*i.e.,* a confederate or "fence"—it would have been easy enough to provide for punishment of one who conceals, barters, sells, etc., a stolen motor vehicle "received from" a person who trans-

ported it in interstate commerce. The language which Congress used shows that it intended to punish anyone who separately does the affirmative acts which Section 2313 prohibits, whether he is the transporter or someone else.

The intent of Congress, as shown by the language of the statute, to punish separately the activities specified in Sections 2312 and 2313 is particularly applicable to this case. The violator of Section 2312, the transporter, need not be the thief, and the indictment here suggests that petitioner in fact was not. The indictment indicates, and must be construed to allege, that the transportation of the stolen automobile from Georgia to Kentucky on or about February 12 was not related to the theft, which occurred almost a month before, or to the concealment after the theft, which began immediately after the theft when the automobile was first brought to Kentucky from Florida (see *supra*, pp. 10–12). Certainly, it would be incongruous to hold that a person who transports a stolen automobile cannot be separately punished for acts which are prior to and apparently not related to that act of tranporting—acts designed in some other way to keep the automobile from its original owner.

Petitioner's reliance (Pet. Br. 8) on the common-law doctrine that a thief cannot be a receiver is misplaced.[2] The rationale of the rule was that a thief

[2] This rule has not hitherto found general acceptance in the federal courts, even where the theft itself is a federal crime. Under the doctrine that Congress may punish separately each

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

could not receive from himself. But, even at common law, if one was convicted of larceny as an aider and abettor, and did not himself take part in the actual taking of the goods, he could be convicted as a receiver. *Inman* v. *United States,* 243 F. 2d 256 (C.A. D.C.), certiorari denied, 358 U.S. 888; *Aaronson* v. *United States,* 175 F. 2d 41 (C.A. 4). Thus, the basis of the common-law rule is that receipt of the goods by the actual thief is an integral and necessary component of the crime of larceny itself. Accordingly, the logic of the common-law rule does not apply at all in this case. Transportation and concealment are not necessary to the other; each can and often does occur alone. Moreover, even when the same person does both acts, the act of transportation does not necessar-

---

step of a single transaction (*Albrecht* v. *United States*, 273 U.S. 1, 11; *Burton* v. *United States*, 202 U.S. 344, 377), the lower courts have held that possession of stolen property, even by the thief himself, at a time and place different from the time and place of theft, constitutes a crime distinct from the theft. *Carroll* v. *Sanford*, 167 F. 2d 878 (C.A. 5); *Carroll* v. *United States*, 174 F. 2d 412 (C.A. 6), certiorari denied, 338 U.S. 874; *United States* v. *Dunbar*, 149 F. 2d 151 (C.A. 7), certiorari denied, 325 U.S. 889; *Thomas* v. *United States*, 249 F. 2d 429 (C.A. 9), certiorari denied, 355 U.S. 936; *Carpenter* v. *Hudspeth*, 112 F. 2d 126 (C.A. 10). Recently, this Court held in *Heflin* v. *United States*, 358 U.S. 415, that a bank robber may not also be convicted and given a consecutive sentence for receiving stolen property, but this decision was based specifically on the particular history of the bank robbery statute (see *infra*, p. 28). It is not necessary for present purposes to determine whether *Heflin* weakens the force of the earlier federal decisions, since, as discussed in the text, the common-law rule is clearly not applicable to this case. See *Milanovich* v. *United States*, 275 F. 2d 716 (C.A. 4), pending on writ of certiorari, No. 79, this Term.

ily bear a relationship to the concealment. It is possible and not uncommon for a person, whether the thief or someone else, to repaint a motor car, change its numbers, etc., or perform any other affirmative separate act of concealment, and then one month or six months later transport the automobile over state lines. It cannot be said that in such a situation the transportation bears the same relationship to the concealment by the transporter as would the receipt of an automobile by the thief. And, at most, the common-law doctrine to which petitioner adverts would permit an analogy where the acts of concealment in fact occurred during transportation immediately after the theft and as part thereof. Since the indictment shows that such was not the situation here—that the charged concealment began long before the charged transportation—petitioner cannot rely upon that doctrine.

B. THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

The legislative history of the National Motor Vehicle Act does not conclusively answer the question before the Court—whether a person who violates both Sections 3 and 4 of the Act can be punished separately for these offenses, particularly where the violations are separate and not part of a single transaction. Nevertheless, this legislative history does show that Congress considered the offenses covered by the Act as extremely serious and intended to punish in Sections 3 and 4 two distinct activities involving stolen vehicles. Thus, the legislative history suggests that Congress intended to punish separate violations of both sections of the Act even when the same person commits both offenses.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, H. Rep. No. 312, accompanying H.R. 9203, 66th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, stated that the purpose of the bill was for:

> * * * the providing of severe punishment of those guilty of the stealing of automobiles in interstate or foreign commerce. There has been and is now a most widespread demand for such a law. State laws upon the subject have been inadequate to meet the evil. Thieves steal automobiles and take them from one State to another and ofttimes have associates in this crime who receive and sell the stolen machines. The losses to the people of the United States by reason of this stealing amounts to hundreds of thousands of dollars every year. It is getting worse. It is getting so now that it is difficult for the owners of the cheaper cars to obtain theft insurance, due to the great loss that insurance companies have sustained. During the past year automobile theft insurance on this class of cars has increased 100 percent. It is automobiles of that price that are generally stolen. Automobile thieves who make a specialty of this crime do not steal many of the higher priced cars, the reason being of course that they are not so easily sold. * * *

In the House debate, Congressman Dyer, the sponsor, announced that the purpose of the legislation was to suppress crime in interstate commerce, and continued (58 Cong. Rec. 5472):

> * * * Automobiles admittedly are tangible property, capable of being transmitted in interstate commerce. The larceny of automo-

> biles is made a crime under the laws of all the States in the Union. No good reason exists why Congress, invested with the power to regulate commerce among the several States, should not provide that such commerce should not be polluted by the carrying of stolen property from one State to another. Congress is the only power competent to legislate upon this evil, and the purpose of this bill is to crush it with the penalties attached.
>
> * * * * *
>
> [The bill] provides, gentlemen, for only two things. Section 3 provides for the punishment of a thief stealing a car and transporting it from one State to another. Section 4 provides for the receipt of the stolen car by thieves in another State for the purpose of selling and disposing of it.

In the debate in the Senate, Senator Cummins spoke of the two separate sections of the Act here involved in the following words (58 Cong. Rec. 6434):

> * * * The practice is to steal an automobile close to a State line and run it across the State line. The first section [Section 3] is intended to punish anyone who does that thing, knowing the vehicle to have been stolen. The further practice is, if possible, *to dispose of the vehicle to some other party, confederate or otherwise, when it gets across the State line, and section 4 is for the purpose of punishing a man who barters or sells or disposes of the property with intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, or if he conceals it knowing it to have been stolen.* * * * [Emphasis added.]

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

When he spoke of the further practice to dispose of the vehicle to some other person, confederate or otherwise, Senator Cummins seems to have had the practice of the transporter-thief in mind. His statement indicates that, in committing such additional acts, the transporter would be guilty of an offense under Section 4 as well as Section 3.

Consistent with the government's contention, the 79th Congress, which amended the original Act to include stolen aircraft (59 Stat. 536), interpreted Sections 3 and 4 as proscribing separate and distinct crimes without reference to whether one or more persons were involved in the transaction. Both S. Rep. No. 40, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, and H. Rep. No. 866, 79th Cong., 1st Sess., p. 1, stated:

> The National Motor Vehicle Theft Act, enacted October 29, 1919, makes it a crime to transport or cause to be transported in interstate commerce a motor vehicle knowing the same to have been stolen. It is also a crime to receive, conceal, store, barter, sell or dispose of such a motor vehicle knowing that it has been stolen. Maximum penalties under the act are fixed at $5,000 fine, or 5 years' imprisonment, or both.

In sum, nothing in the legislative history suggests that all acts performed with respect to one stolen vehicle—no matter how many times transported, or how many different places concealed, or how separate the transportation and concealment—are subject to only one punishment. Rather, it indicates that where, as here, the transportation and concealment are disparate, the separate acts may be separately punished.

C. THE JUDICIAL DECISIONS

The question involved in the instant case as to whether a person may be separately punished under Sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act for transporting and concealing the same automobile was before this Court in *Woody* v. *United States,* 359 U.S. 118. There the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit (258 F. 2d 535), that one person can commit separate offenses under the separate provisions of the statute with respect to the same automobile, was affirmed by an equally divided Court. Since no record was before the court of appeals—no transcript was made of the evidence until after the grant of certiorari (see the government's brief in *Woody,* No. 135, Oct. Term, 1958, p. 5, note 2)—the court of appeals' decision was based on an indictment similar to that involved in the instant case except that there was no comparable indication that the transportation was unrelated to the theft or the concealment (see the Record in *Woody,* p. 20). Rather, the first count simply alleged transportation and the second alleged receipt and concealment, all on or about March 16, 1954, thereby suggesting that they were parts of a common transaction. Thus, as the case appeared before the court of appeals, it was considerably more favorable for Woody than the situation of petitioner before this Court.

As the *Woody* case was presented to this Court, the transcript showed concealment occurring both before and after the transportation alleged (see the

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

government's brief in *Woody,* pp. 5–6). This evidence established, like the indictment in the present case, that the concealment and transportation were separate acts (see the government's brief in *Woody,* pp. 23–25). In addition, the evidence in *Woody* included affirmative acts of concealment such as changing motor members, executing a false bill of sale, painting, and other major repairs. While such evidence was of course not offered in the present case because petitioner pleaded guilty, it is just as consistent with the indictment here as that in *Woody* and might well have been offered if the case had been tried. Construing the indictment, as we must (see *supra,* pp. 11–12), in the manner most favorable to the government, it can be assumed that petitioner also engaged in affirmative, specific acts of concealment. In that sense, the present case is substantially the same as *Woody* as the latter case was considered both by the court of appeals and by this Court.

The lower federal court decisions have consistently taken the position that, since the two sections of the Act provide separate offenses for transporting a stolen automobile and for receiving and concealing it, cumulative sentences may be imposed. *York* v. *United States,* 299 Fed. 778 (C.A. 6); *Chrysler* v. *Zerbst,* 81 F. 2d 975 (C.A. 10); *Doll* v. *Johnston,* 95 F. 2d 838 (C.A. 9), certiorari denied, 304 U.S. 574; *Jackson* v. *Hudspeth,* 111 F. 2d 128 (C.A. 10); *Record* v. *Hudspeth,* 126 F. 2d 215 (C.A. 10), certiorari denied, 316 U.S. 703; *Lindsay* v. *United States,* 134 F. 2d 960 (C.A. 10), certiorari denied, 319 U.S. 763; *Batson* v. *Squier,* 146 F. 2d 264 (C.A.

9), certiorari denied, 324 U.S. 874; *Pifer* v. *United States,* 158 F. 2d 867, 868 (C.A. 4), certiorari denied, 329 U.S. 815; *Madsen* v. *United States,* 165 F. 2d 507, 510 (C.A. 10); *Crawford* v. *United States,* 214 F. 2d 313 (C.A. 6); *Austin* v. *United States,* 224 F. 2d 273 (C.A. 6); *United States* v. *Hampden,* 294 Fed. 345 (E.D. Mich.); *United States* v. *Runion,* 47 F. Supp. 594 (E.D. Ky.); *United States* v. *Spradley,* 65 F. Supp. 136 (W.D. Ky.), affirmed, 162 F. 2d 203 (C.A. 6);[3] see also 56 A.L.R. 2d at 1321 (§ 8) and at 1379 (§ 47). These cases (except *York*) arose on collateral attack and the courts found it unnecessary for the most part to determine whether in fact the offenses were part of one act of transportation as the defendant normally alleged. They held that, even on that assumption, the offenses were distinct since each section of the statute required proof of acts which the other did not. For example, in *Chrysler* v. *Zerbst, supra,* the court said (81 F. 2d at 976):

> * * * [e]ach count of the indictment charged a separate and distinct offense. The offense charged in count one involved the element of transportation in interstate or foreign commerce, and receiving and concealing the motor vehicle was not an element thereof. The offense charged in count two involved the elements of receiving and concealing the motor vehicle and transportation thereof in interstate commerce by the defendants, was not an element of that offense.

[3] In the *Chrysler*, *Doll*, *Jackson*, *Lindsay*, *Runion*, and *Spradley* cases, the defendant entered a plea of guilty, just as did petitioner in the instant case.

POOR COPY
BLEED THROUGH

And in *Lindsay* v. *United States, supra,* the separability of the two statutory offenses was recognized in this language (134 F. 2d at 960–961):

> Congress may prohibit and make punishable as a separate and distinct offense each separate and distinct act or step of a single transaction which embraces an element which the others do not.
>
> * * * * *
>
> While the offenses charged in count two may have been directly related to the transportation of the automobile from Portales to Tulsa and a continuation of that transaction, each required proof of a fact not required to establish the charge in count one, namely, receiving, concealing, and storing the automobile. It follows that the offenses charged in count two were separate and distinct from the offense charged in count one.

It is unnecessary, however, to adopt so broad a rule to sustain the sentences in this case, since here the concealment was separate and apart from the transportation. A similar situation was involved in *United States* v. *Hampden, supra,* although there the concealment and storage occurred after the transportation, instead of before the transportation as in the case now before the Court. In denying a petition for modification of sentences, the court said (294 Fed. at 348):

> * * * It certainly cannot be said in the present case that the concealing or storing of the stolen automobile in Detroit was necessarily an incident of its transportation to Detroit. Such

> transportation ended on arrival at its destination. The concealment and storage occurred after such arrival. Petitioner, in fact, concedes that in the systematic stealing of automobiles, which the Dyer Act was designed to reach, one party usually does the stealing, and another party at the end of the line receives and stores and sells the stolen transported automobile, and that it was the purpose of this statute to make each of these acts a crime, and thereby to punish each offender concerned therein. *The fact, however, that each of these acts, which Congress has thus defined as a separate legal offense, has been committed by the same person, instead of by several persons, cannot render them any the less separate offenses,* and, the jury having found that petitioner committed each of the forbidden acts, he was properly convicted and sentenced for each of the crimes created by Congress and charged in the indictment. [Emphasis added.]

None of the recent decisions of this Court on which petitioner relies (Pet. Br. 7, 14–18) is applicable to the present case. While these decisions might be relevant if the transportation and concealment were related parts of a single transaction—such as concealment during the period of transportation—this is not, as we have pointed out, the situation here (see *supra,* pp. 10–14). The cases are not relevant when the two acts punishable are entirely separate. In *Bell* v. *United States,* 349 U.S. 81, 83–84, in explaining the rule of lenity, the Court said that, "if Congress does not fix the punishment for a federal offense clearly

and without ambiguity, doubt will be resolved against turning a single transaction into multiple offenses". The rule of lenity thus applies to the situation where the offenses involve a single transaction; it is a rule "against turning a single transaction into multiple offenses" where the Congressional intent is not clear. In holding that the transportation of two women across state lines at the same time constitutes only a single offense under the Mann Act, the Court did not cast the slightest doubt on the proposition that the transportation of the same woman at two different times would be two offenses under that statute. Similarly, *Ladner* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 169, decided that a person who assaults two federal officers while under arrest by the single discharge of a shotgun commits only a single offense under former 18 U.S.C. 254 (now 18 U.S.C. 111).[4] Obviously, the single discharge of a shotgun constitutes a single act or transaction in the narrowest physical sense. In *Gore* v. *United States,* 357 U.S. 386, the majority held that Congress intended to authorize separate punishment under different narcotics statutes, although the offenses derived from a single transaction.[5] And even the dissenting opinions, while claiming that a single

[4] The case was remanded to the district court for a hearing as to whether the two officers were in fact wounded by one shot or more.

[5] Petitioner attempts (Pet. Br. 18) to distinguish *Gore* on the ground that there "Congress was making criminal separate acts in a context where one person might commit all, or less than all, of those acts." But of course this is just as true with regard to Sections 3 and 4 of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act.

sale constituted only one offense, did not imply that the two separate sales, which were proved, constituted only one offense.

Prince v. *United States,* 352 U.S. 322, involved a "narrow" question concerning "a unique statute of limited purpose," the Federal Bank Robbery Act (*id.* at 325; see also *Gore* v. *United States, supra,* 357 U.S. at 391–392). The Court held that Congress did not intend to punish the same person for both entry into a bank with intent to rob and the completed robbery after entry. But, again, this holding forbids multiple punishment in a factual situation where both offenses are part of a single continuous act or transaction.* And the decision in *Heflin* v. *United States,* 358 U.S. 415 (that a bank robber could not be separately punished for receiving the money he had helped to steal), not only turns, like the *Prince* case, on the particular history of the bank robbery statute, but involves the common-law conceptual difficulty in separating receiving from stealing (see *supra,* pp. 16–18). As discussed above, there is no such conceptual difficulty

* Moreover, the entry and completed robbery are part of the same act or transaction in all cases where both are charged, not merely in the particular factual situation involved in *Prince.* For, while entry can be accomplished without a completed robbery, the converse is not true; a completed robbery of a bank must necessarily be preceded by an entry. Thus, in the absence of contrary statutory language or legislative history, it is logical to assume that Congress did not intend to punish every successful robber for both the completed robbery and the necessarily preliminary entry. Here, however, as we have shown (*supra,* pp. 14–15), transportation and concealment can occur without the other, and they occur together only when the same person chooses to use both methods to keep the automobile from its owner.

BLEED THROUGH POOR COPY

here where the transportation need not be, and was not, related either to the theft or the concealment. Moreover, the Court indicated in *Heflin* that, as in *Prince,* the question at issue was "the intent of Congress in punishing multiple aspects of the same criminal act" (358 U.S. at 419).[7] Here, the concealment and the transportation could be, and the indictment indicates that they were, separate in time and presumably in purpose.

In short, this Court has never held or even suggested that separate acts are not separately punishable even under the same statutory provisions. Instead, the cases cited by petitioner concern whether a single act or transaction may constitute more than a single punishable offense, and the holdings of the Court on this issue have turned on the language and legislative history of the particular statute. But here we do not have the analogous issue whether Congress intended acts of concealment to be separately punishable when

---

[7] Petitioner claims (Pet. Br. 17) that in *Heflin*, like the present case, the Court was limited to consideration of the face of the indictment and that thereafter "it would have been possible to conjure up the possibility that the robbers had committed separate acts with respect to the loot. In fact, the Court mentions the possibility that the robbers may have gotten together after the robbery and divided up the loot—clearly a separate act committed at a separate time and place and not inherent in the act of robbing." But while dividing up the loot is a separate physical act from robbery, it is obviously closely related to robbery and may well be considered as part of a single transaction. In the present case, the indictment indicates that the concealment was unrelated to the transportation which occurred long after the concealment began (see *supra*, pp. 10–11), and the indictment should, under the decisions of this Court (see *supra*, pp. 11–12), be so construed.

they occur at the time, and as a part, of the transportation. On the contrary, here the concealment and transportation were separate acts, each of which Congress has made punishable. To sustain petitioner's position, it would be necessary to hold that acts of concealment which are clearly distinct from and in addition to the transportation are not subject to separate punishment. Such an interpretation would be contrary to the words of the statute, its legislative history, and the decisions of the lower federal courts and of this Court.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the judgment of the court below should be affirmed.

J. LEE RANKIN,
Solicitor General.
MALCOLM RICHARD WILKEY,
Assistant Attorney General.
BRUCE J. TERRIS,
Assistant to the Solicitor General.
BEATRICE ROSENBERG,
ROBERT G. MAYSACK,
Attorneys.

DECEMBER 1960.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1960

POOR COPY